

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-20 are now pending in the application. The amendments to the claims contained herein are of equivalent scope as originally filed and, thus, are not a narrowing amendment. The claim amendments are fully supported by the application as originally filed. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 9, 10, 12-14 and 16-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Shaver (U.S. Pat. No. 5,996,870). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Amended Claims 1 and 6, along with original Claims 12 and 16 recite, in part, an elongated support rail fixedly secured to said article carrier structure. In contrast, the Shaver reference appears to disclose a tray 34 secured to a trailer hitch 20 (Figure 1B). The Shaver reference fails to disclose, or suggest, an elongated support rail fixedly secured to an article carrier structure, as set forth in Claims 1, 6, 12, and 16. Therefore, the Shaver reference fails to anticipate, or render obvious, Claims 1, 6, 12, and 16, and those claims dependent therefrom. Consequently, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal and reconsideration of this rejection.

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Graber et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 4,702,401). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Amended Claims 1 and 6, as well as original Claims 12 and 16, recite, in part, a foldable wheel support "substantially supporting an entire weight of said bicycle in a

substantially vertical orientation." In contrast, the Graber et al. reference appears to disclose a wheel clamp means 12 that does not support substantially the entire weight of the bicycle. Because the support device of Graber et al. is a horizontal support device, the entire weight of the bicycle would appear to be supported by the channel 10, not the wheel clamp means 12. In fact, if the support device of Graber et al. is orientated vertically, the bicycle will, with reference to Figure 3, most likely move to the right and be released from the clamp means 12, which does not appear able to support the entire weight of the bicycle due to the configuration of the clamp means 12. The Graber et al. reference therefore fails to disclose, or suggest, a foldable wheel support substantially supporting an entire weight of the bicycle in a substantially vertical orientation, as set forth in amended Claims 1 and 6, and original Claims 12 and 16. Consequently, the Graber et al. reference fails to anticipate, or render obvious, Claims 1, 6, 12, and 16, and those claims dependent therefrom. Thus, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

#### **CONCLUSION**

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the

Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Oct. 23, 2003

By: Mark D. Elchuk  
Mark D. Elchuk  
Reg. No. 33,686

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600

BGS/kq